

REMARKS

1. Status of the Pending Claims

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed January 13, 2004. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-41 are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-41 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The cover sheet of the Office Action incorrectly indicates that the Attorney Docket number is 061606-8470. The correct attorney docket number is 061606-1470, as noted in the header of the Applicant's Specification. In future correspondence, Applicant requests that the attorney docket number be identified as 061606-1470.

3. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-41 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

In the Office Action, claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

a. Response to Office Action, Paragraph 4.1, alleges that the Specification fails to disclose a "summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day"

The Office Action, at paragraph 4.1 alleges that the phrase "wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day" (as recited in claim 1) is not supported in the Applicant's Specification. Applicant respectfully traverses this allegation.

For the convenience of the Examiner, repeated below are the two paragraphs that contain the selected "quotations" used by the Office Action to reject claim 1:

In block 104, the user, such as a network administrator or a network engineer, specifies a plurality of summary periods and a report period for the port for which data traffic will be analyzed. ***In the preferred embodiment, a summary period includes the days and the times of the day that are of interest.*** For example, as will be described in greater detail in FIG. 4 hereinafter, ***a summary period may be defined as the days of Monday through Friday, and the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.*** The report period encompasses the plurality of summary periods. Each summary period must encompass the same corresponding period of time consequently within the reporting period. For example, and as will be explained in greater detail with FIG. 4 hereinafter, a reporting period ***could*** include five summary periods (Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) and a specification of the starting date of each summary period (five consecutive Mondays).

One skilled in the art will appreciate that the above example of a summary period and a reporting period are ***merely intended as illustrated examples.*** One alternative embodiment of processor 64 would provide user capability to specify a summary period and a reporting period tailored to the particular needs of the user. Another alternative embodiment would require the user to specify the port of interest when database 74 (FIG. 2) contains historical data for multiple ports.

(Specification, Page 16, Lines 4-20, Emphasis added.)

The Office Action apparently misconstrues the Specification because the Office Action selectively chooses parts of the Specification to support its rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The Office Action, at Paragraph 4.1, alleges that the “Specification Page 16, lines 6-11 state that a summary period includes the days and the times of the day that are of interest.” The Office Action uses the above-described partial quotation to allege that the sentence applies to ***all embodiments*** of the invention. The entire sentence is provided below for the convenience of the Examiner

“In the ***preferred embodiment***, a summary period includes the days and the times of the day that are of interest.” (Emphasis added, Page 16, Lines 6-7.)

This selective use of only a portion of the above sentence fails to quote what the Specification actually teaches because the quoted sentence above actually describes the “preferred embodiment” of the invention. In fact, the entire quoted sentence above ***does not apply to all*** embodiments as alleged, but rather, applies to the preferred embodiment. Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner that ***other embodiments are permissible.***

An alternative embodiment is described in the very next sentence of the Specification. This sentence describes an alternative embodiment wherein “a summary period *may* be defined as the days of Monday through Friday, and the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.” (Emphasis added, Page 16, Lines 7-9.) The above sentence clearly describes another embodiment of the invention where the summary period is defined as five consecutive days (“Monday through Friday”), and where the summary periods may be “the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.”

In the above-described alternative embodiment, the Specification clearly discloses that a summary period may be “the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.” This disclosure corresponds to a “portion of a day” since the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. do not constitute an entire day. That is, the clear and ordinary meaning of the phrase “portion of a day” permissibly describes this alternative embodiment (wherein the phrase “portion of a day” corresponds to an embodiment defining a summary period as “the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.”).

Other embodiments of a “summary period” are also disclosed. The next paragraph of the Specification teaches that “one *alternative embodiment* of processor 64 would provide user capability to specify a summary period and a reporting period tailored to the particular needs of the user.” (Emphasis added, Page 16, Lines 16-18.) Clearly, this sentence alone discloses other alternative embodiments.

Accordingly, the Applicant was clearly in possession of embodiments of the invention, as defined by the limitations of pending claim 1, at least prior to the filing date of the pending Application.

b. Response to Office Action, Paragraph 4.1, that alleges that the Specification fails to disclose “each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period”

The Office Action, at paragraph 4.1 alleges that the phrase “each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period” (as recited in claim 1) is not supported in the Applicant’s Specification. Applicant respectfully traverses this allegation.

Applicant refers the Examiner to the above-quoted Specification from Page 16, Lines 4-20. There, the Specification discloses that “a summary period may be defined as the days of Monday through Friday, and the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. The report period

encompasses the plurality of summary periods.” Here, the five exemplary summary periods are described as the days of Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday (during the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.). The Specification then clearly discloses that “the report period encompasses the plurality of summary periods.” Accordingly, the recited feature of claim 1 is disclosed since “each said summary period” (“defined as the days of Monday through Friday, and the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.”) corresponds “to a different portion of said reporting period” (Monday through Friday).

Accordingly, the Applicant was clearly in possession of embodiments of the invention, as defined by the limitations of pending claim 1 (“each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period”), at least prior to the filing date of the pending Application.

c. Response to Office Action Paragraphs 4.2-6

The Office Action, at paragraphs 4.2-5, alleges that there is no support in the Applicant’s Specification for the limitation “a user interface, wherein a user specifies a report period, said report period corresponding to a reporting period of interest, and said user specifies a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day” (as recited in claim 12), for the limitation “specifying a report period, said report period corresponding to a reporting period of interest and a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day” (as recited in claim 23), for the limitation “receiving a specification for a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day” (as recited in claim 34), and for the limitation “retrieving a plurality of selected data parameters from a communication device, such that said plurality of selected data parameters corresponds to a plurality of summary periods, and wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day” (as recited in claim 36). The Office Action then alleges that there is

“no support for the amendments to the claim limitations made in claims 37-41 in the specification as described in paragraph 4.1 above.” Applicant respectfully traverses these allegations.

The Examiner is respectfully referred to sections a and b above of this Office Action Response which clearly demonstrates that these above-recited limitations are fully disclosed in the Applicant’s Specification. Accordingly, the Applicant was in possession of the embodiments of the invention, as defined by the limitations of pending claims 12, 23, 34 and 36-41, at least prior to the filing date of the pending Application.

d. Response to Office Action Paragraph 4.7

The Office Action, at paragraph 4.7, states that “Claims rejected but not specifically addressed are rejected based upon their dependency to a rejected claim.” Applicant respectfully traverses this allegation.

The Examiner is respectfully referred to sections a, b and c above of this Office Action Response which clearly demonstrate that the above-recited limitations of pending claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 are fully disclosed in the Applicant’s Specification. Accordingly, all limitations of the dependent claims are disclosed (when rejected because of their dependency upon rejected claims), thereby demonstrating that the Applicant was in possession of embodiments of the invention, as defined by the limitations of the pending claims, at least prior to the filing date of the pending Application.

e. Rejection of Claims 1-41 Has Been Overcome

Because the Specification clearly discloses the claimed subject matter of the recited limitations of pending claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as allegedly “containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention” has been overcome. Additionally, since the subject matter of the dependent claims (depending upon the rejected independent base claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36) is fully disclosed, the rejection of the dependent claims has been overcome. Since the rejection of claims 1-41 has been overcome,

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-41 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

4. Response to Paragraph 5 of the Office Action, "Claim Interpretations"

In the Office Action, at paragraph 5, the Office Action states that "since the amendments to the claim limitations made to the independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 are not supported by the specification, claims have been interpreted in the light of the specification."

Applicant is not able to understand the nature of the above statement of paragraph 5 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant requests clarification in the next Office Action (or in an Advisory Action) explaining the meaning and purpose of this statement in the present Office Action.

5. Applicant Believes That Claim Amendments Were Not Entered and That Amended Claims Were Not Considered

Applicant does not believe that the amendments to claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41, submitted by the Applicant in the Response filed November 17, 2003, were entered for at least the reasons provided below. Furthermore, Applicant believes that the subject matter of the amended claims has not been examined and considered in this Office Action.

First, the Office Action at paragraph 7.1 maintains an identical rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being allegedly anticipated by *Engel et al.* (EN) (U.S. Patent 6,320,585). The Office Action alleges that EN discloses "means for specifying a plurality of summary periods, each summary period corresponding to a portion of the reporting period (CL1, L54 to CL2, L5; CL8, L22-34)." This is identically the same rejection asserted in the first non-final Office Action mailed August 13, 2003.

The amended feature of a "summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period," and the feature of a summary period that "corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day," are not recited in the rejection of claim 1 in this Final Office Action. For at least this reason alone (failure to recite the amended features of claim 1 in the present Office Action), Applicant believes that the amendments to claims 1, 12, 23, 34

and 36-41 were not entered, and that the amended claims are not considered in the present Office Action.

Second, Applicant provided clear explanation why *Engel et al.* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the amended features of claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41. For example, in claim 1, a “summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period” and the feature of a summary period that “corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day” are recited. Applicant believes that had the amendments to claim 1 been entered and considered in the present Office Action, claim 1 would not remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being allegedly anticipated by *Engel et al.* Maintaining such a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, in light of the amendment to claims 1, would be improper because *Engel et al.* simply does not disclose, teach or suggest the above-described amended features. Similarly, the other independent claims would not remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being allegedly anticipated by *Engel et al.* For at least this reason alone, Applicant believes that the amendments to claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 were not entered and are not considered in the present Office Action.

However, if the Applicant is mistaken in his belief that the amendments to claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 were not entered, and that the amended claims are not considered in the present Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests clarification.

In the Applicant’s response to the first non-final Office Action (mailed August 13, 2003), Applicant clearly demonstrated that the amended features of claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 are not disclosed by *Engel et al.* in the recited sections CL1, L54 to CL2, L5 and CL8, L22-34. MPEP §2136.02 clearly indicates that the “REFERENCE MUST ITSELF CONTAIN THE SUBJECT MATTER RELIED ON IN THE REJECTION” (printed in bold font in the MPEP). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the next Office Action (or the Advisory Action) provide clear articulation precisely where in *Engel et al.* the recited subject matter of amended claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 is allegedly disclosed.

If rejection of the amended claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 is maintained under 35 U.S.C. 102 as allegedly anticipated by a different reference, Applicant requests that another Office Action be issued by the Examiner. That is, maintaining a rejection of the amended claims under a new reference (used for the first time in a new rejection) cannot be properly made in an Advisory Action.

Furthermore, if the basis of a new rejection of the amended claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 is alleged under 35 U.S.C. 103, Applicant respectfully requests that cited references be provided. That is, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner “cite a reference in support of his or her position” or provide an affidavit specifically stating the alleged “facts within the personal knowledge of the examiner” as required under MPEP §2144.03

6. Response to Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 8-10, 12, 13, 19-21, 23, 24, 30-32 and 34-41 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 8-10, 12, 13, 19-21, 23, 24, 30-32 and 34-41 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by *Engel et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,320,585), hereinafter *Engel*. Applicant amended independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 in the Applicant’s Response filed November 17, 2003. For convenience of the Examiner, the reasons which demonstrate that *Engel* does not disclose, teach or suggest the amended features of claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 is repeated hereinbelow.

a. Independent Claim 1

In the Office Action, at paragraph 7.1, it is alleged that “EN teaches displaying resource performance and utilization information. Specifically, as per claim 1, EN teaches a system for determining and predicting performance of a communication device (CL1, L54 to CL2, L5; CL2, L14-29; CL9, L5-6).” The Office Action then alleges that *Engel* teaches a “means for specifying a report period, said report period corresponding to a reporting period of interest (CL2, L14-29; CL8, L20-23)” and then alleges that *Engel* teaches a “means for specifying a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a portion of said reporting period (CL1, L54 to CL2, L5; CL8, L22-34)” as recited in claim 1.

However, *Engel* **requires** that “the polled data be collected on the relevant variable for a base line period (e.g. 3-6 weeks).” (Col. 8, lines 21-22.) In *Engel* “from the polled data that is accumulated in the database at the console, the report generator produces a history table 90, such as shown in FIG. 9. The history table 90 includes a record 92 for ***each day*** of a ***baseline period***. ... The granularity of the data that is stored in the history table is one day. Thus, the entry that is placed in the time field is the day for which the data corresponds.” (Emphasis added, Col. 8,

lines 35-43.) Accordingly, “the report generator then produces a stack bar for each segment (step 115).” (Col. 7, lines 35-36.)

Applicant respectfully points out that the *Engel* stack bar *corresponds to a time period of one complete day* because *Engel* teaches that “it should be noted that if data for some of the polling cycles was not received, the total number of polls represented was not received, the total number of polls represented in the segment table will be less than the total number of possible polls for the day. In this case, the height of the stack bar (i.e., the combined height of the individual sections) will be less than 100%. In other words, when a ‘white space’ appears at the top of the bar this indicates to the network administrator that some problem interfered with the collection of data for that segment.” (Col. 7, lines 56-64.) The *Engel* stack bars are illustrated in *Engel* FIG. 2. *Engel* further emphasizes the point that every stack bar corresponds *to one complete day* by stating that “the total height of a stack bar 30 is a sum of the heights of all of the sections. If the segment was fully operational and all bandwidth utilization statistics for it were successfully gathered throughout the day, the total height will be 100%. However, if the segment was not operational throughout the day or less than all bandwidth utilization statistics were successfully gathered, the total height 16 will be less than 100%.” (Col. 5, lines 8-15.)

Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to the Applicant’s FIG. 2, wherein the claimed “Summary Period” illustrated in FIG. 2 is from Monday through Friday, for the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., which is entirely different from the *Engel* stack bar 30 corresponding to one entire day. Applicant asserts that claim 1, as amended, is clearly distinguishable from the above-described teachings of *Engel* for at least the following reasons.

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. Section 102, the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended by the Applicant in the Response filed November 17, 2003, is allowable for at least the reason that *Engel* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of a “means for specifying a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day” and a “means for presenting and displaying said plurality of performance parameters associated with

each said summary period, and for presenting and displaying said plurality of trend parameters associated with said report period, in a trend report” as recited in claim 1. Since *Engel* does not disclose, teach, or suggest using the above-recited features of claim 1, the rejection should be withdrawn.

b. Independent Claims 12, 23, 34 and 36-41

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 12, 23, 34 and 36-41, as amended by the Applicant in the Response filed November 17, 2003, are allowable for at least the reason that *Engel* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the features of claims 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 (Emphasis added) listed hereinbelow:

“a user interface, wherein a user specifies a report period, said report period corresponding to a reporting period of interest, and said user specifies a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and ***wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day***” as recited in claim 12,

“specifying a report period, said report period corresponding to a reporting period of interest and a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and wherein ***each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day***” as recited in claim 23,

“receiving a specification for a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and wherein ***each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day***” as recited in claim 34,

“retrieving a plurality of selected data parameters from a communication device, such that said plurality of selected data parameters corresponds to a plurality of summary periods, and ***wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day***” as recited in claim 36,

“a user interface, wherein a user specifies a report period, said report period corresponding to a reporting period of interest, and said user specifies a plurality of

summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and *wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day*” as recited in claim 37,

“means for specifying a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and *wherein each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day*” as recited in claim 38,

“specifying a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and wherein *each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day*” as recited in claim 39, and

“a user interface, wherein a user specifies a report period, said report period corresponding to a reporting period of interest, and said user specifies a plurality of summary periods, each said summary period corresponding to a different portion of said reporting period, and wherein *each said summary period corresponds to a portion of a day, and wherein said portion is less than a day*” as recited in claims 40 and 41.

Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to the arguments above for allowability of claim 1 which also demonstrates that the recited features of independent claims 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by *Engel*. Since *Engel* does not disclose, teach, or suggest using the above-recited features of claims 12, 23, 34 and 36-41, the rejection to claims 12, 23, 34 and 36-41 should be withdrawn.

c. Dependent Claims 2, 8-10, 13, 19-21, 24, 30-32 and 35

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2 and 8-10 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2 and 8-10 contain all features/elements of independent claim 1. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

Similarly, because independent claims 12, 23 and 34 are allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 13 and 19-21 (which depend from independent claim 12), dependent claims 24 and 30-32 (which depend from independent claim 23), and dependent claim 35 (which depends from independent claim 34), are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 13, 19-21, 24, 30-32 and 35 contain all features/elements/steps of their respective independent claim. Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

7. Response to Rejection of Claims 3-7, 11, 14-18, 22, 25-29 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

a. Claims 3-7, 11, 14-18, 22, 25-29 and 33 are Allowable Because They Are Dependent Claims Depending Upon an Allowable Independent Claim

In the Office Action, claims 3-6, 14-17 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Engel*, in view of *Hassell et al.* (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0018473), hereinafter *Hassell*. Additionally, claims 7, 18 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Engel* in view of *Hassell*, and further in view of *VanDervort* (U.S. Patent 5,699,346). Finally, claims 11, 22 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Engel* in view of *Colmant et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,144,662).

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 3-7 and 11 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 3-7 and 11 contain all features/elements of independent claim 1. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

Similarly, because independent claims 12 and 23 are allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 14-18 and 22 (which depend from independent claim 12), and dependent claims 25-29 and 33 (which depend from independent claim 23), are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 14-18, 22, 25-29 and 33 contain all features/elements/steps of their respective independent claim. Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

b. Hassell Is Not a Proper Reference Under 35 USC 103(c)

As noted above, claims 3-7, 14-18 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 USC 103 using *Hassell* as a secondary reference. However, under 35 USC 103(c), "subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more subsections (e), (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." (See also, MPEP §214.)

Here, *Hassell* is a 35 USC 102(e) type reference. *Hassell* was assigned to Paradyne Corporation at the time of invention of the subject matter of the instant application. A copy of the assignment of *Hassell* to Paradyne Corporation (Exhibit A) is provided for the convenience of the Examiner. At the time of invention, the subject matter of the present invention was also under a common obligation of assignment to Paradyne Corporation. Therefore, *Hassell* is not a proper reference upon which a rejection under 35 USC 103 can be maintained. Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-41 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond W. Armentrout
Reg. No. 45,866

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

Response to Final Office Action
Serial No.: 09/580,700
Art Unit: 2123



61606-1950
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER
OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

EXHIBIT A

OCTOBER 03, 1998

PTAS

THOMAS KAYDEN HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY LLP
SCOTT A. HORSTEMEYER
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, SUITE 1500
ATLANTA, GA 30339



100774534A

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
NOTICE OF RECORDATION OF ASSIGNMENT DOCUMENT

THE ENCLOSED DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RECORDED BY THE ASSIGNMENT DIVISION OF THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE. A COMPLETE MICROFILM COPY IS AVAILABLE AT THE ASSIGNMENT SEARCH ROOM ON THE REEL AND FRAME NUMBER REFERENCED BELOW.

PLEASE REVIEW ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS NOTICE. THE INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS RECORDATION NOTICE REFLECTS THE DATA PRESENT IN THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK ASSIGNMENT SYSTEM. IF YOU SHOULD FIND ANY ERRORS OR HAVE QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS NOTICE, YOU MAY CONTACT THE EMPLOYEE WHOSE NAME APPEARS ON THIS NOTICE AT 703-308-9723. PLEASE SEND REQUEST FOR CORRECTION TO: U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, ASSIGNMENT DIVISION, BOX ASSIGNMENTS, CG-4, 1213 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY, SUITE 320, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231.

RECORDATION DATE: 07/17/1998

REEL/FRAME: 9325/0935
NUMBER OF PAGES: 4

BRIEF: ASSIGNMENT OF ASSIGNOR'S INTEREST (SEE DOCUMENT FOR DETAILS).

ASSIGNOR:

HASELL, SUZANNE

DOC DATE: 07/17/1998

ASSIGNOR:

STEINBERGER, ROBERT

DOC DATE: 07/17/1998

ASSIGNEE:

PARADYNE CORPORATION
8545 126 AVENUE NORTH
LARGO, FLORIDA 33773

SERIAL NUMBER: 09118106
PATENT NUMBER:

FILING DATE: 07/17/1998
ISSUE DATE:

MAYA BENNETT, EXAMINER
ASSIGNMENT DIVISION
OFFICE OF PUBLIC RECORDS